REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8, 12, 15, 20-22, 24-26 and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,420). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed to the problem that a range-over may occur upon decompression of a once compressed image due to quantization processing, meaning a pixel value obtained through the decompression may exceed an available range defined for a pixel value. For example, 8-bit image data may exceed a value of 255 or may be lower than zero when decompressed (see page 3, lines 18-24). Wang is directed to rate control for including a code amount or a compression rate into a desired range upon compressing a moving picture. Wang corrects a code amount upon *encoding* (see column 3, line 49-column 4, line 8) while the present invention handles a pixel value obtained from *decoding* (see page 3, lines 12-17; page 28, lines 19-25).

The Office Action points to Figure 2 and column 13, lines 4-35 of Wang as describing the part "at least reducing the deviation on a pixel having a value deviating from a predetermined range through inverse transform of image data from a frequency domain" of independent claims 1, 20, 24 and 28. This cited section of Wang discloses obtaining an absolute pixel difference between frames for the purpose of detecting the amount of difference in movement between frames, wherewith an encoding parameter (quantization parameter) λ is controlled accordingly. However, the limitation of claims 1, 20, 24, and 28 relates to the reduction in the number of pixels exceeding a predetermined range obtained from inverse frequency transform. Unlike Wang, in the present invention, there is no necessity of considering pixel value difference between frames, since a static image is processed. The pixel values of the present invention are compared to a predetermined range and not to each other, as in Wang.

Additionally, Wang discloses a "filtered previous absolute pixel difference", meaning that an initial offset is given to a pixel value difference (see column 12, line 53-

column 13, line 3), and the "filtering" mentioned in Wang does not mean the same thing as "frequency transform" of the present invention. According to Wang, the *quantization parameter* λ is changed based on the difference between the "current absolute pixel difference" and the "filtered absolute pixel difference" (see column 4, lines 38-66). In contrast, according to the present invention, the *pixel value* itself is changed (see page 28, lines 5-19). Thus, the phenomenon and the object to be handled are clearly different than those of Wang.

For the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 20, 24, and 28 should be patentable over Wang. Because independent claims 1, 20, 24, and 28 are patentable over Wang, so should be dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 12, 15, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 for the reasons stated above and for other reasons.

Claims 13-14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,420) in view of Aono (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,451). Because independent claim 1 is patentable over Wang, so should be dependant claims 13-14 and 16-17 for the reasons stated above and for other reasons. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,420) in view of Keith (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,176). Because independent claim 1 is patentable over Wang, so should be dependent claims 18 and 19 for the reasons stated above and for other reasons. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-11, 23, 27 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Since, as argued above, the base claims should be allowable, applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 4-11, 23, 27 and 31 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Petition for and Extension of Time (one-month) is being filed concurrently herewith.

Dated: April 27, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

                                          By _____

                                          Mark J. Thronson
                                              Registration No.: 33,082
                                          DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
                                              OSHINSKY LLP
                                          2101 L Street NW
                                          Washington, DC 20037-1526
                                          (202) 785-9700
                                          Attorneys for Applicant

4